

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 26, 28, 30-31, 50-51, 54-60, and 62-68, and have cancelled claims 25-27, 29, 32-49, 54, and 62, during prosecution of this patent application. Applicant is not conceding in this patent application that the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims, and to pursue other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The Examiner objected to claims 50-53, 58-61 and 66-69 as being dependent upon an alleged rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter and have accordingly so rewritten claims 50-51, 58-59, and 66-67 in independent form.

The Examiner objected to the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 26, 54 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over USP 2004/0002878 to Hinton in view of USP Application Publication 2004/0210767 to Sinclair et al., hereinafter Sinclair.

The Examiner rejected claims 28, 55 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinton and Sinclair as applied to claims 26, 54 and 62 and in further view of USP Application Publication 2001/0048025 to Shinn.

The Examiner rejected claims 30, 56 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinton and Sinclair as applied to claims 26, 54 and 62 and in further view of USP Application Publication 2002/0091928 to Bouchard et al., hereinafter Bouchard.

The Examiner rejected claims 31, 57 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinton and Sinclair as applied to claims 26, 54 and 62 and in further view of USP Application Publication 2004/0107212 to Friedrich et al., hereinafter Friedrich.

Applicant respectfully traverses the specification objection and the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

Specification Objection

The Examiner objected to the specification.

The Examiner argues: “The specification is still objected because the actual inline reference on page 1, paragraph 3 are still present. The applicant has stricken out the Non-patent document 1 & 2 from page 2. These references need to be moved and substituted in page 1 where the stricken references are still mentioned. For example the "see Hiroshi Maruyama et al., "Web..." can be placed inside the parenthesis located on page 1, paragraph 2, line 3-4.”

In response, Applicant has amended the specification in accordance with the preceding suggestion by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 26, 54 and 62

The Examiner rejected claims 26, 54 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over USP 2004/0002878 to Hinton in view of USP Application Publication 2004/0210767 to Sinclair et al., hereinafter Sinclair.

Since claims 26, 54, and 62 have been cancelled, the rejection of claims 26, 54, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 28, 55 and 63

The Examiner rejected claims 28, 55 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinton and Sinclair as applied to claims 26, 54 and 62 and in further view of USP Application Publication 2001/0048025 to Shinn.

Since claims 28, 55 and 63 depend from allowable claims 51, 59, and 67, respectively, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 28, 55 and 63 are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 28, 55 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 30, 56 and 64

The Examiner rejected claims 30, 56 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinton and Sinclair as applied to claims 26, 54 and 62 and in further view of USP Application Publication 2002/0091928 to Bouchard et al., hereinafter Bouchard.

Since claims 30, 56 and 64 depend from allowable claims 50, 58, and 66, respectively, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 30, 56 and 64 are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 30, 56 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 31, 57 and 65

The Examiner rejected claims 31, 57 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinton and Sinclair as applied to claims 26, 54 and 62 and in further view of USP Application Publication 2004/0107212 to Friedrich et al., hereinafter Friedrich.

Since claims 31, 57 and 65 depend from allowable claims 50, 58, and 66, respectively, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 31, 57 and 65 are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 31, 57 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM).

Date: November 25, 2009

/ Jack P. Friedman /
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Customer No. 30449
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
Telephone (518) 220-1850
Facsimile (518) 220-1857
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com